

# **Liberation**

**May 1957**

**30c**



THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 26 1957

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

## **RELIGION**

**BILLY GRAHAM**

**KOINONIA**

**GOD and the CAMPUS**

## In this Issue-

The persecution of KOINONIA COMMUNITY has been headlined in newspapers and magazines all over the world. **LIBERATION** is proud to present the first published account by **CLARENCE JORDAN**, Koinonia's founder, of the principles and practice that have made the present conflict so significant. A 50-minute tape recording by Jordan can be ordered from Friends of Koinonia, 901 Findlay St., Cincinnati 14, Ohio. (\$3.00, postpaid)

**LAWRENCE SCOTT** is a graduate of the Baptist Theological Seminary and a member of the coordinating committee of Peacemakers. He has been working recently as a peace and education secretary of the American Friends Service Committee.

**MAURICE FRIEDMAN** has taught at Ohio State and the New School for Social Research. He is now on the faculty of Sarah Lawrence College. He is the author of a critical study of Martin Buber.

**ROY FINCH** teaches philosophy at Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York.

**A. J. MUSTE** has been watching evangelists come and go during his 40 years as a Christian minister.

**LEROY C. DOTY** is a clergyman of the Church of the Brethren and Executive Secretary of the National Service Board for Religious Objectors.

The discussion on **RELIGION** will be continued in the July issue. Letters and articles are invited.

## Liberation

an independent monthly

110 Christopher St. New York 14, N. Y.  
CHelsea 3-5411

Care of Housmans, 3 Blackstock Road, London N4

Subscriptions: 1 year . . \$3.00; Individual Copies . . 30¢  
Make checks and money orders payable to **LIBERATION**

### CONTENTS

Vol. II, No. 3

<i>The Billy Graham Crusade</i>	4	A. J. Muste
<i>Ordeal by Bullets</i>	8	Clarence Jordan
<i>The Return of Nerve: Religion and the New Generation</i>	11	Roy Finch
<i>Words are Not Enough</i>	14	Lawrence Scott
<i>Who Created Whom?</i>	16	Maurice S. Friedman
<i>The Army as School and Church</i>	18	C. LeRoy Doty, Jr.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Dave Dellinger  
Roy Finch  
A. J. Muste  
Bayard Rustin

#### ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Sidney Lens  
Robert Pickus  
Mulford Sibley  
Charles Walker  
Denny Wilcher

Victor Paschke  
Kenneth Patchen  
James Peck  
Benjamin Reid  
Kenneth Rexroth  
Pitirim Sorokin  
Kurt H. Wolff  
Curtis Zahn

#### CONTRIBUTORS

Michael Amrine  
Frank Bello  
Claire Huchet Bishop  
Charles Bloomstein  
Don Calhoun  
Martin J. Corbin  
Dorothy Day  
Eileen Fantino  
Waldo Frank  
Richard Gregg  
Wallace Hamilton  
Michael Harrington  
William Hesselstine  
Keith Irvine  
Homer A. Jack  
Paul Jacobs  
Herbert Kelman  
Roy Kepler  
Norman Mailer  
Frank Marquart  
Milton Mayer  
Helen Mears  
Lewis Mumford  
William Neumann

**Berlin**  
Henry Holm  
**Calcutta**  
Nirmal Kumar Bose  
**London**  
Vera Brittain  
Reginald Reynolds  
J. Allen Skinner  
**New Delhi**  
Krishnalal Shridharani  
**Vancouver**  
George Woodcock

#### ARTISTS

Rita Corbin  
William Lovett

#### PHOTOGRAPHER

Harold Feinstein

#### PROMOTION

Robert Gilmore

#### BUSINESS MANAGER

Ralph Di Gia

## PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

On April 12, 1957, the eighteen leading nuclear physicists of West Germany declared that West Germany could best defend itself and world peace "if it expressly and freely went without the possession of any kind of atomic weapons". Of even more significance was their declaration that *not one of them would be prepared to participate in any way in the production, testing and use of atomic weapons.*

The announcement came from the Max Planck Institute at Gottingen, source of many of the epoch-making advances in nuclear physics. Four Nobel Prize winners were among the signers, including Otto Hahn, who was first to split the atom.

A reservation must be entered, because the German scientists apparently based their position largely on the fact that West Germany is a small country in a peculiarly defenseless position. Even so, the fact that these men assume personal responsibility as human beings and declare they will have nothing to do with production, testing and use of atomic weapons, constitutes an important development in the struggle to end war.

Chancellor Adenauer was quick to come up with the contention which multitudes of scientists themselves have advanced for their failure to take a conscientious objector stand toward the production of nuclear weapons. Their counsel, said Adenauer, "has nothing to do with physical science. That is a purely foreign policy matter"—to be handled presumably by the government or perhaps citizens as citizens. The physicists admitted they were not politicians but contended that it was precisely their scientific work which placed upon them the responsibility for the possible consequences of their labor.

To our surprise, a couple of days later Adenauer retreated from this position and spent an entire day with several of the scientists who had joined in the protest, discussing the very subject with which he had declared they were incompetent to deal. Since Adenauer had apparently shelved any further rebukes of the conscientious objectors, they joined

with him in a statement which urged all governments and peoples to join in an effort to abolish nuclear armaments.

There is some evidence that during World War II some of the same scientists, including Otto Hahn himself, deliberately steered German research away from the atomic bomb field, even after they knew that the U.S. was working on an atomic bomb. If this is the case, now is the time for all the facts to be made public. Some months ago it was revealed in Moscow that the great Russian physicist Kapitzka was for a number of years imprisoned by Stalin because he refused to prostitute his genius to making nuclear weapons.

Where are the American, and other Western, scientists of comparable standing to take their place by the side of Hahn and Kapitzka? What could any government do if leading scientists on grounds of conscience, humanity and scientific integrity refused to prepare the weapons with which the race can destroy itself? How shall each of us, whether scientist or laborer, discharge his responsibility in this matter?

Scientists and technical workers in this country who have an interest in the problem should immediately contact the Society for Social Responsibility in Science through Dr. Franklin Miller Jr., Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.

## HONEST CORRUPTION

The most *striking* corruption in the labor movement is that being exposed by the McClellan Committee's investigation of Beck, Brewster, and the rest of the murky Teamsters' clan. But in the long run the most *dangerous* corruption is that of the respectable, open, and honest leaders of labor.

Hiring new auditors to check on union books or setting up watchdog committees of respectable public men will not touch the real malady, which is the acceptance by labor of the capitalist ethic of competitive inequality. Even the most honest unions display an ever-widening gulf between the power, prestige, and income of the top leaders and that of the lesser porkchoppers, between the porkchoppers and the rank and file. Competition for personal aggrandizement

dominates the relationship between skilled workers and the less skilled, between union members and unorganized workers. At its recent convention the United Automobile Workers adopted a 5-point program which increases the differentials between skilled and unskilled workers, including granting separate bargaining rights to the skilled workers.

In labor, as in business, there are dishonest men of privilege and power and there are honest men of privilege and power. There is dishonest selfishness and there is honest selfishness. The current tendency is to swallow the basic concept of selfish competition for special privilege and for power over the lives of others, but to gag at certain "illegal" methods of carrying on the conflict. Thus it is dishonorable for a labor leader to put his hand into the till when no one is looking, but it is all right for him to get his political machine to push through a democratic vote increasing his salary to ten or fifteen times the average for wage workers in the shops. The workers themselves are so infected by the spirit of inequality that they often put pressure on leaders like Walter Reuther to accept such differentials.

Because in certain areas the personal ethics of Reuther and the Auto Workers is in such refreshing contrast to that of Beck and the Teamsters, there is a temptation to rally around the U.A.W. as a symbol of what a union should be. This overlooks not only the hierarchical class-stratification of unions like the U.A.W. but also the narrow business unionism which concerns itself solely with high wages and short hours for the members and does not consider larger questions of social ethics. As long as the price is right, it becomes in practice a matter of complete indifference to the U.A.W. whether the men produce cars designed to last or to wear out soon enough to promote frequent sales, cars engineered primarily to enrich the stockholders or to meet the needs of the users. For that matter, it is considered outside the province of the U.A.W. (and other "forward-looking" unions) to want its labor power devoted to the manufacture of useful articles at all, if there is a higher take in manufacturing bombers or tanks.





IN THE COURSE of gathering material for this article I visited the headquarters of Billy Graham's New York "Crusade", located in a business building off Times Square. When I explained to the young woman at the Information Window that I was a clergyman and planned to write one or more articles about Billy Graham, she called a messenger who, after being briefed, disappeared into an inner office. The messenger came back with the suggestion that the person I probably should see was Miss Lowry, Director of Public Relations for the N. Y. Crusade. The young lady disappeared again to announce me, I surmised, to Betty Lowry, as she is called in the March, 1957, issue of the *Billy Graham New York Crusade News*. Her promotion to the important new job is set forth on the same page with an impressive photograph of Billy and V. P. Dick Nixon, Dick's hand on Billy's shoulder, taken at a breakfast of International Christian Leadership at which the V. P. represented Eisenhower. Present also were Chief Justice Earl Warren, Sherman Adams and "approximately 200 members of Congress."

Presently I was informed that Miss Lowry was tied up in an interview but her associate, a Mr. Coleman, would see me. When the latter learned that I planned to write about the Crusade, he put a card in his typewriter, wrote down my name and address, and urged that I be sure to let them have a copy.

This led to a brief tour around the office in the course of which I learned about the difficulty the organization is having with filling orders for little plastic disks which fit over the center of the standard telephone dial. They read: "Pray for the Billy Graham New York Crusade—Madison Square Garden—Begins May 15, 1957". In

another room employed and volunteer workers were busy with over half a million reserved seat tickets to be sent to out-of-town delegations coming to Madison Square Garden.

Mr. Coleman explained that except for one or two Crusades at the start of the Billy Graham organization, clippings of all news items about the campaigns, copies of all magazine articles, etc., are preserved and are available for inspection.

I learned that William Franklin Graham was born on a farm near Charlotte, N. C. His parents were members of a fundamentalist denomination, the Associate Presbyterian Church. Billy is now a Southern Baptist. He joined the parental church at twelve, but dates his conversion from a revival five years later. When he walked to the front to declare his commitment, "there was", as he later described it, "that quiet resolve that I belonged to Christ. Next morning when I went to school, even the leaves on the trees looked different. It was a deep thing."

### Celebrities for Christ

HE WAS ORDAINED as minister in the Southern Baptist Church in 1939, and went to the fundamentalist Wheaton College at Wheaton, Illinois, "to work for a degree in anthropology with the class of '43", as one of his biographers phrases it. He became active in Youth for Christ, a socially conservative movement, which gained a considerable following in the middle and late forties. By 1948 he had become president of a fundamentalist institution, Northwestern College, in Minneapolis. Carrying on evangelistic campaigns seems to have been part of the job, and it was in such a

# The BILLY GRAHAM CRUSADE

A. J. MUSTE

camp  
becam  
click.  
conve  
cowbo  
sold  
was t  
the m  
tried  
at on  
whene  
Jane  
is not  
about  
life h  
case o  
Angel  
on to  
Bio  
suppo  
Byrne  
of Te  
Talm  
exten  
variet  
in thi  
The C  
reason  
of thi  
take  
efficie  
elapse  
organ  
adds  
Grah  
budge  
On  
one i  
ment  
this c  
place  
"look  
and l  
prepa  
they  
progr  
enlist  
traini  
and s  
organ  
(prin  
Billy  
Th  
write  
May,

campaign, in Los Angeles in 1949, that Billy suddenly became "big time". Somehow, the meetings began to click. Crowds came, and among them celebrities. One convert of this crucial campaign was Stuart Hemblen, cowboy singer who owned a string of race horses. He sold them and reorganized his life. A bigger sensation was the conversion of J. Arthur Vaus, wire-tapper for the notorious gangster, Mickey Cohen. Billy and Vaus tried to bring Cohen into the fold. They did not succeed at once, but recent newspaper publicity reveals that whenever he can fit it in, Cohen has a "talk" with Billy. Jane Russell attended meetings but with what result is not quite clear. Graham is reported to have said about Miss Russell: "A good friend whose spiritual life has been made very difficult." Much clearer is the case of Donn Moomaw, University of California at Los Angeles football star, who became a convert and went on to study for the ministry at Princeton Seminary.

Biographers record that Billy at this time acquired supporters among big public figures such as James F. Byrnes, racist governor of South Carolina, Allan Shivers of Texas, G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, Herman Talmadge of Georgia, Earl Warren. This list could be extended almost indefinitely, and in as bewildering a variety, from business and political ranks, not only in this country, but in a good many places abroad.

### The Graham Corporation

ANY ANALYSIS, however brief, of the reasons for Graham's popularity and of the meaning of this phenomenon in contemporary religious life must take note of the fact that Graham heads a big and highly efficient organization. In the short time which has elapsed since the 1949 triumph at Los Angeles, this organization has amassed a vast store of experience, and adds to it deliberately and systematically. The Billy Graham Association Inc. at Minneapolis has an annual budget of over two million dollars.

One of the key brochures for campaigns such as the one in New York consists of brief, mostly factual statements, by eight ministers from eight different cities, in this country and England, where Crusades have taken place. Each clergyman explains what he would do, "looking back on the Billy Graham Crusade in my city and having seen its great potential, if I were facing the preparation again". The following are among the items they emphasize: Organize the whole (local) Church program around the Crusade; organize prayer groups; enlist the support of men; capitalize on counsellor training (volunteers who nurse the "converts" along and see that they are put in touch with some church); organize the membership to reach the unchurched (primarily to get them to make up a party going to a Billy Graham meeting); follow-up recorded decisions.

The back page of this brochure summons people to write for supplies of prayer cards; book a "Billy Gra-

ham film", order more "Crusade publicity material, which is free and postpaid", schedule your church programs for a minimum of conflicts during the Crusade period. The concluding exhortation in a list of nine is a somewhat puzzling one: "If necessary, have your official board vote now to participate". Whatever else a Billy Graham Crusade may be, it is a typical contemporary high-pressure American feat of organization.

Corollary to this, is the most meticulous attention to advertising and publicity. A Billy Graham campaign is a Madison Avenue super-product. The cardinal tenets of simplicity, directness, repetition, are unswervingly observed. One of the main cogs in the publicity machine during the famous meetings at Harringay auditorium in London describes how every piece of literature, every press notice, every radio announcement focused on two things: Billy Graham and Harringay. Every piece of literature for the N. Y. Crusade carries Billy Graham's name and picture. In a recent year, radio and television time cost the Minneapolis office over one and a quarter million dollars. Numerous details are given to fix the hypnotic image. Billy's home life; the fact that in recent years he has worn out ten copies of the Bible which he takes with him on the platform at every meeting; that his pacing up and down the platform in one sermon sometimes totes up to fifteen miles. The publicity never fails to mention the number in attendance at a meeting and the number who make a "commitment".

### Graham's Tie with Churches

BILLY GRAHAM's Crusades are closely tied in with the life of the churches. This has not always been the case with leading evangelists who have tended to be critical of the churches and whose campaigns have been regarded as disruptive of their day-to-day work. The reasons why people come to hear Billy Graham are substantially the same as those which have brought about the rise in church membership and attendance; which have brought it about that the attacks on religion and the church of an earlier period have come to be regarded as bad form, while acceptance of participation in church life has become part of the pattern of correct living in the United States to a degree not to be found in any other Western country. Whether by a lucky inspiration or by careful reasoning, Billy Graham swims with this powerful current. The huge audiences at his meetings furnish an essentially minor, in itself almost insignificant, illustration of the trend whose true and significant index we can read in the reports on church attendance every Sunday morning all over the land.

### Why the Return to God?

WHAT IS BACK of this trend? In the first place, the "prosperity" of the American churches is to a large extent based on the "prosperity" of American



society as a whole. Where there is relatively so much money there is also more for the churches.

This holds good, of course, only for institutions which have adapted themselves to the prevailing outlook. This is a culture in which the dominant attitude is conformity. It is not enforced here in the brutal and mechanical fashion of totalitarian societies, though brutality is by no means wholly absent, as in the phenomenon we call McCarthyism. Nevertheless, there are subtle ways in which to discourage eccentricity. The prizes for fitting into the pattern are attractive and the cost of dissent prohibitive, in an inflationary economy, except for those who still believe—and live by the belief—that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom.

The churches, in general, have adapted themselves. Like everything else they are highly organized. This in itself puts a premium on smooth operation. Controversy is de-emphasized. Preaching tends to be "spiritual" rather than social gospelish. In this context, to belong to the church in one's locality is a way of publicly registering that one is conforming and not an odd fish. But it also enables many to feel that in conforming they are not demeaning themselves but are living at a deeper if also "safer" level than before.

Billy Graham fits perfectly into the pattern. Evangelists of an earlier period were controversial and sharp in their attacks on the liquor interests, gambling, prostitution. Billy Graham is naturally against these things, but his "Crusade" is not against them as social and political phenomena. Old-time Protestant evangelists usually directed their campaigns to a considerable degree against Popery, as they called it. Billy Graham has no controversy with the Roman Catholic Church, nor that Church with him. The controversy between fundamentalism and so-called liberalism, in spite of occasional clashes, is muted in the churches. So is the more sophisticated controversy between neo-orthodoxy and liberalism. The same pattern holds for Billy Graham and his crusades. In the New York Crusade, leaders of the non-fundamentalist Protestant Council and the larger liberal denominations are working together with the fundamentalist leaders.

To cite another example, pacifism and non-pacifism are still not the same thing, but the churches labor to keep the differences from becoming an issue. Billy Graham used to make off-hand statements about Christians naturally having to support their country in time of war; but here again he increasingly avoids controversy. Similarly he made a glib remark just before the opening of his London Crusade about combatting socialism as one of the enemies of the Gospel, but quickly explained that this was a *slip of the tongue*. Socialism and capitalism are not matters of controversy with him, either.

## Eisenhower and Graham

THERE IS, of course, one issue in which the churches, especially in the South, are involved and where differences cannot be blurred. The Negro churches, as LIBERATION has more than once pointed out, are here playing a crucial and, in a sense, revolutionary role. The general run of white churches are gravely compromised. In the main the approach taken by agencies such as the National Council of Churches and the denominational bodies in the North is to stand for the right, (segregation is a violation of the very essence of Christian teaching) and to avoid controversy (not to let the tragic events in the South become an issue in the churches or between the churches and Eisenhower). Again, this is precisely Billy Graham's approach. He wrote an article on segregation in *Life* magazine some months ago. I started reading, I confess, with the conviction that at some point he would hedge. He did not. So far as I know, the article nevertheless created no furore in the South. I must assume that this is in part a tribute to the image of Billy Graham that his organization and others have built up. He is in his field much like Eisenhower, untouchable, beyond the reach of criticism, because he is so sincere, so full of good will, so bent on having peace and simple goodness among men. But like Eisenhower he does not act if this entails controversy. He does not speak at the time and place where to do so would face people with a decision not about a general commitment to Christ but about calmly and lovingly defying the White Citizens Council for Christ's sake. No more than Eisenhower does he have a vital contact with Martin Luther King or with Clarence Jordan of Koinonia.

All this implies that both the current revival in church membership and the message of Billy Graham are in considerable measure surface phenomena. It is to cast some doubt as to whether they are truly "religious" developments or can be called Christian in the Biblical or classic sense. If we are looking for religious or Christian developments, we may have to look elsewhere, perhaps to some people and events described elsewhere in this issue.

## Billy at Yale

THE YALE *Daily News*, far from unsympathetic either in its reporting or editorial evaluation of Billy's four days at Yale in February, observed after his first "lecture" (sic) that, although "one was struck by the intensity of his statement, one was equally struck by the presence of a wall of incommunicability between him and his audience, by the fact that they lacked a common ethical vocabulary". Its fourth and concluding editorial on "God at Yale" said: "It is pretty clear that Billy Graham was not exactly Yale's cup of tea. The brand

of Christianity which he reiterated in his four talks struck the average undergraduate as embarrassingly overdramatic and clearly unintellectual."

This same editorial, however, cautions that "one ought not to minimize the effect of the mission", and its conclusion is that "despite the irrelevance of his message... the ultimate effect of his appearance here was incontrovertibly tonic".

We must now seek to state why this is so, or our own analysis of Billy Graham will be superficial and in a sense distorted.

Large numbers of Americans, intellectuals as well as ordinary people, feel needs which drive them "back to religion" or at the very least to talking about it. In a society which is highly organized, where relationships are not organic or "given" but essentially utilitarian and fragmented, people feel the need of being "rooted", of "belonging" in something more like a natural community or to Some One who cares for the individual, in his entire being and as he is.

Another phase of the need arises from the fact that the problems of the nuclear age seem too huge and complicated to handle. The once prevalent notion that either "science" or radical social action has the answers to man's dilemmas and will, singly or in cooperation, bring in the new and fraternal social order no longer seems valid. Young people of the present generation, are not optimistic and "committed" as were those of an earlier generation. But, if radical social action will not deliver us, the question inevitably arises whether somewhere else, in one's self, in "religion", we can find fulfillment and peace. If there is no "cause" that can enlist us passionately, is God or Christ seeking our "commitment"? Is there "a hiding place down here"?

Here, I think, we come to Billy Graham's strong point and such genuine relevance and validity as his message has. His own experience of conversion is decisive and normative. Recall his testimony: "There was that quiet resolve that I belonged to Christ. Next morning when I went to school even the leaves and the trees looked different. It was a deep thing."

So far as I have been able to ascertain, even his severest critics agree that for Billy this experience was a "real thing", and still is. He is sincere. He is humble. His limitations are of the intellect and of the world in which he lives, toward which his attitude is basically uncritical. He has an experience of acceptance by God—"forgiveness"—and of commitment to a Master. To a good many people he is able to mediate the same kind of experience. However, the "home" to which he leads them is essentially the church of the contemporary American scene. The overwhelming majority of his converts, I surmise, revert to the church of their childhood or of their parents, with many of its angularities,

which once irritated them, removed, a church which has been streamlined, as have other institutions.

There are, accordingly, as his experience at Yale indicates, multitudes to whom Billy Graham cannot mediate salvation. But even to them the crass anti-religion of an earlier day no longer seems clever or apposite and upon them the effect of encountering such integrity and conviction as Billy Graham embodies is, as the *Yale News* said, "incontrovertibly tonic". We have no space to elaborate the point but it is hardly conceivable that Yale University would invite Norman Vincent Peale to conduct a mission, or if it did that Yale students would react to him as they did to Graham. What Peale would give them would be, at best, a popularized version of an elementary "success" psychology. Billy Graham has something over Peale and the general run of peace of mind (or soul) merchants.

In conclusion, it is true, in my own opinion, that man is not merely a creature but a creator of society. He has, therefore, needs which society, the outward ordering of life, cannot fill, and his ultimate allegiance is not to any existing society, to any institution or "cause". There is no such thing as achieving the perfect society, certainly not if that means something fixed and static.

### Escapism

THE TROUBLE is that in periods like the present when these things are brought home to men by cataclysmic experiences, the tendency is to equate the return to God with retreat from the world or, more accurately, adaptation to the world as it is. The fact that the social conflict brings abysmal frustration and, in any case, has its limitations is taken to justify abandonment of the struggle and concentration on what is sometimes called the cultivation of the inner man. Become appalled at the Commissar whom you once obeyed, your recourse is to become a Yogi, suggests Koestler. Fulfillment can come only in heaven or some version of Nirvana, or, according to another school, "beyond history."

The truly "religious" approach is something quite different. It has nowhere, in recent years, been so exactly and beautifully stated, to my knowledge, as in the Penguin study: *William Blake: A Man Without a Mask*, by the distinguished British physicist, J. Bronowski. Probably Blake is usually thought of as a mystic. He was also a "revolutionary, seeking man in his societies", living in the era of the Industrial Revolution, the American and French Revolutions, the Napoleonic Wars. Almost alone of the circle which included Wordsworth and Southey, he remained a revolutionist to the end.

Not that Blake believed society or revolution could make men good, or achieve goodness in the most profound sense. Man must indeed, says Bronowski, "be set free to make his good. But he must still make his

continued on page 19





# ORDEAL

by

# BULLETS

Clarence Jordan

IN 1942, MY WIFE and I and another family bought an old run-down farm in southwestern Georgia. The purpose was to start an intentional community based on the teachings of Jesus. We had hardly gotten on the place, when we had some Negro visitors. We invited them in, and since it was mealtime, we sat down and ate. A little later, some white neighbors dropped in. When they saw what was going on right there in south Georgia, their mouths dropped open. I knew there would be trouble after that.

A few days later, some gentlemen came and said they had been sent by the Ku Klux Klan. They said: "We might as well come right to the point. We want you to know that we don't let the sun set on folks that do things like that here."

I put on my broadest smile, stuck out my hand, and said: "Well, I'm just so happy to meet you. All my life I have wanted to meet people who had power over the sun." I said that we would be watching with great interest that night. But sure enough, when nighttime came, the sun went right on down. There wasn't any Joshua in the Klan after all.

I had grown up in the State of Georgia, and early had become aware of a tremendous struggle going on in the hearts of the people. All about me, people were professing a loyalty to Jesus Christ, who taught that God is the father of all his children and that all are equally precious in his sight. Yet that was not a reality around us. Even as a little child, I couldn't help noticing that at Christmas, the white children were given the good oranges while the Negro children got rotten oranges from the merchant's garbage pail.

As I grew older, I noticed other tensions between the environment and the Christian gospel of love. I lived in a rural area where there was a great deal of poverty. Preachers were always thundering about Hell and

brimstone when it seemed to me they should have spent a little time telling about phosphate and limestone.

I decided to go to agricultural college and try to come back to my people to help unite them in Christian love and brotherhood. After I finished at the University of Georgia, I was still restless. I had become aware that men do not live by bread alone but by words that proceed from the mouth of God. So I went to the Southern Baptist Seminary to learn what those words of God might be.

## The Principles

AFTER SEMINARY, my wife and I joined with a family from South Carolina who had something of the same vision. This was the beginning of Koinonia Community. From the first it was based on four principles:

1. *The equality of the believers, economic and otherwise.* Property and ownership have a tremendous ability to separate people. We want to get rid of that divisive wall, so in our fellowship we have *no* earthly possessions. We renounce all personal property and have common ownership. Jesus said that it is hard for a rich man to get into the Kingdom of Heaven. We have never even had one apply. But we don't take any chances. We unload everyone at the door. We pass the collection plate just once—and take it all. In the same spirit, all of our important decisions are by unanimous agreement rather than by majority rule.

2. *Distribution by need.* Everything that we earn goes into one common purse, and distribution is on the basis of need, not greed or knowledge or power or skill or influence. There are no pay checks or salaries.

3. *An open door to all irrespective of race, color, or nationality.* We have not been crusading for integration, but we live by the belief that all persons are children



of God. The only requirement for coming to Koinonia is to be a human being. As a guest comes to understand how we are trying to live, he may want to become first a novice, then a provisional member, and finally a full member. Full members are followers of Jesus and believe that we cannot find the Kingdom of God except as part of a loving fellowship. At the present time there are about 60 people at Koinonia, one fourth of whom are Negroes. The large majority of us are native Southerners.

4. *A belief in non-violence as superior to violence and in active goodwill as superior to non-violence.* As followers of Jesus we abhor violence in all its forms. Even when attacked, we will not retaliate. We carry no guns. We would do violence to no man, not even in our thoughts. In accord with this, we refuse to serve in the armed forces and, in many cases, even to register for the draft. But we believe that Jesus taught *more* than non-violence: he taught active good-will, the overcoming of evil with good. As we have been ostracized, boycotted, and repeatedly shot at, as buildings have been dynamited or set on fire at night, this principle has been sorely tested, but we have learned to believe even more strongly that it is the only realistic way to combat evil.

### The Practice

IN THE EARLY DAYS, one of our neighbors was very bitterly opposed to us because of the racial situation. He fought us all the way, tooth and toenail, until one day he had an outbreak of blackleg in his cattle. Blackleg kills very quickly, and the only cure for it is inoculation. The County Agent and all the veterinarians were away, and he couldn't get anyone to do the inoculation. Somebody told him that we could do it, and he came with his head hanging down to ask us. I went in and inoculated his cattle, and when it was all over he wanted to pay us. We told him that it had been a privilege to help him and that we would not accept any money. This seemed to touch him. He couldn't imagine that we would respond to somebody who had opposed us as bitterly as he had. He became one of our closest friends.

This demonstrates why we don't believe just in the absence of violence. Non-violence could have said: "All right, old boy, we've got you over a barrel. Let your calves die. You've been mean to us; we'll be non-violent to you." But the actual practical expression of goodwill is the strong thing in the Christian approach.

When we first decided to try to overcome evil with good, we ran into some unexpected problems. We thought we would put out a program of agricultural missionary activity to reach out to the people and be a blessing to them. I had graduated from agricultural college and was ready to spout information any time. But somehow I wasn't quite prepared to cope with the actual problem

of farming myself. So every morning our missionary activity consisted of getting up on the top story, looking to see what our neighbors were doing and then doing the same thing. If they were plowing, we plowed; if they were planting, we planted.

Gradually as we put our theory and our practice together, we became more and more skilled and we introduced scientific poultry farming in that area. We wrote to a man in Virginia that we were trying to introduce a better strain of poultry and wanted fifty of the finest chickens. He wrote that he was interested in what we were doing and wanted to *give* us the chicks. To our amazement, when they came, instead of 50 there were 500. You can imagine that for a while it was like Old MacDonald's farm—here a chick, there a chick, everywhere a chick-chick. We lost about six one night when I crawled into bed and crushed them.

In the main we had good luck and later on those hens began to lay. I never saw anything shell out like they did. People would come from all around to see those chickens lay and, gradually, as a result of our experiments, the poultry idea spread. When we began, 14 years ago, Georgia was importing approximately 19 million dozen eggs from other states. Now it comes pretty close to supplying its needs. Koinonia itself had to kill off its 3 thousand hens a few months ago when the racial conflict led to such a boycott that we could not market our eggs.

Another thing we noticed was that there were a lot of Negro families with large numbers of children—and not a milk cow anywhere around. So the idea occurred to us that perhaps we could set up a cow library, where a family could come and take out a milk cow and keep her until she went dry and then take out another one. So for a number of years we operated the most unique library we know about, a cow library.

### Expelled from the Church

FOR THE FIRST 8 years we were all members of the local Baptist Church. We didn't press our views but were fairly outspoken about them. In 1950, a student from India visited us and became interested in Christianity. We took him to church with us and people somehow mistook him for a Negro. The following Sunday a resolution was introduced by the deacons excluding all members of Koinonia from membership in the Rehoboth Baptist church. The accusations were that we had eaten with Negroes, had visited Negro churches, had brought a Negro into that church, contrary to its practices and policies, and that we had broken its unity of Christian fellowship.

My wife was the only one present from Koinonia at the time and she made a motion to adopt the resolution on the basis of those charges. Well, the people didn't want to vote with her, and they didn't want to vote

against the motion. It was a church that was quite torn when the preacher called for the vote. Finally a few people struggled to their feet. When the minister called for those opposed, nobody stood, and he said: "I declare the motion carried". Everybody got quiet. Then they got a little more quiet. And then they got a little more quiet. Finally there was kind of a suspension of animation, it seemed. Perhaps for 6 or 7 minutes it was as though everyone was afraid to breathe. Then someone started to sob; then another, and another, and for about 5 minutes the whole church just sat there weeping. Finally, very quietly, one by one they got up and tiptoed out and got in their cars and went home.

On Wednesday, the chairman of the board of deacons, who had drawn up the resolution, came to Koinonia, called me aside, and said: "Brother Jordan, I want to talk to you. There's an awful lot of tension in the community. I don't know what's going to happen. There might be some physical harm befall you and your family. I heard that you were planning to go away speaking, and I came to ask you not to leave until things die down a little." I promised him I would not.

Then he said: "You know, I haven't slept a wink since Sunday. If I do nod or doze a little, somebody comes into the room and starts singing and it just wakes me so wide awake I can't go back to sleep."

I said: "Can you make out what it is they are singing?"

"O yes", he said, and then he started weeping profusely. "It's 'Were you there when they crucified my Lord?'" And in the midst of his tears, he said, "Brother Jordan, I *was* there. And worse than that, I was helping do it. I came down here to ask you to please forgive me."

I put out my hand and said: "Man, I grew up in this section. I know how people feel. I forgave you before it happened."

He said "Well then, will you pray that God will forgive me?"

I said: "No, I won't pray that. When you felt you had sinned against me you didn't send anybody else. You came yourself and you asked, and you got it. Now don't send me to plead your case before God. You do it."

He said, "I'll do it. Let's do it now". So we knelt down, and he asked God to forgive him. When he got up he took my hand and squeezed it tight and said: "Brother Jordan, I want you to know I'm sticking with you. I must go back and take my letter out of the church."

I said, "No sir, I don't want you to take your letter out. But go back up there and so live as to get kicked out."

He got the point. And if there was ever a divine irritant he was one for the next year or two until he died.

Even after we had been turned out, we thought that we should go back and try to overcome evil with good. We figured that mechanical membership didn't mean too much, so the next Sunday we were in our places as

usual. A few days later, the minister came down and said: "I want to ask you never to come back to this church any more. I thought that when we turned you out you could have caught the hint."

"Well", we said, "if we're saints we need the fellowship and if we're sinners we need the gospel, so in any event we ought to be there." But he couldn't see it that way.

Finally we said we would stay away if he would let us come back just one more Sunday and tell the people why we were doing so—not because we were angry with them but purely out of consideration for a preacher who could not preach with us in the congregation. He finally agreed and the next Sunday we made that statement to the congregation. Many of the people came around afterwards to say: "We want you to know that they might keep you out of the church but they can't keep you out of our homes and our hearts."

I tell you this, not to reflect bad or evil on any one but to show you the tremendous struggle going on in the hearts of the Southern people. Like all of us, they are people with the good and the evil pulling inside them, with a struggle between an ideal and a tradition. They want to do what they know Christ teaches but they are not strong enough to break with the tradition in which they find themselves.

### The Supreme Court Decision

A NEW FACTOR was introduced into the situation in 1954 with the Supreme Court decision on integration. For 6 months there was a stunned silence in the South. Then White Citizens Councils were formed, first in Mississippi, then in other states. By the fall of 1955 there was one in Americus, the town in which Koinonia is located, and we were told that the purpose was to get rid of us.

For the past year and a half, there has been a gradually mounting crescendo of attack, economic, legal, and violent. At the present time, we can secure no insurance or agricultural credit and are subject to a boycott so complete that it is virtually impossible to buy or sell anything within 60 to 100 miles of our community. Businessman after businessman has refused to have anything to do with us, saying: "Now understand, there's nothing personal with me. I think the world of you people, but it's either that or my business."

I have repeatedly put it to them that they are facing the same alternatives we are: to be true to their convictions or to sell out to their business.

The lawyers fell like tenpins—even some who had been our close friends. I went to one old friend for help. I showed him an injunction and various other legal papers that had been brought against us. He said: "Clarence, these charges are not at all true; they are trumped up things." I said, "I know they are. I don't need any legal advice to know that. That's why we need you,

continued on page 19





## The Return of Nerve:

# RELIGION and the NEW GENERATION

ROY FINCH

THE WORDS often used to describe the present young generation—"apathetic", "silent", "security-conscious"—reveal more about those who use these terms than about the young. These labels represent attempts to assimilate old attitudes to new ones. Enthusiasms, particularly political and social ones, are not popular today. But those who accuse the young of "apathy" forget how often they have been committed to enthusiasms that have created havoc or that have gotten nowhere. If the choice is between such enthusiasms, "apathy" may be the more decent alternative. Similarly, when the young are urged to "speak up" by those whose speech has become empty rhetoric on the one hand or sectarian jargon on the other, perhaps it is small wonder that they prefer to keep silent. And how many of those who deplore "security-consciousness" are themselves committed to personal insecurity? Many of the young show signs of being fed-up, but it is at a level where they no longer get excited about it.

The attitude of the young today is small-scale—honestly and refreshingly so. They know that they have enough to do to handle their own lives and the problems immediately surrounding them. They do not have the old respect for those who set out to save the world when they cannot manage their own personal and family affairs. Perhaps there is a loss in imagination here, but it is made up for by the gain in honesty. The cardinal sin in the contemporary breviary is "phoneyess", by which is meant pretending to be what we are not, talking big but not being willing to stake anything personally. The world is full of pretence and counterfeit, this attitude says; let us at least try not to fall into *that* trap.

In trying to characterize this frame of mind three

aspects can be singled out: a personalistic emphasis, non-involvement and conventionalism. The growing interest in religion takes place in the context of these and cannot be understood except in terms of them.

The "personalism" is not a conscious philosophy and certainly not the philosophical movement which goes by that name. It is rather a psychological set, a tendency to see things in terms of immediate concrete personal life rather than in large, world-encompassing abstractions. Everything has to be close to home to make an impression on the young. The writers, the philosophers, the historical personalities who most appeal to them are those who speak for the immediate and the personal. They are tired of excitements which fizzle out and crusades which leave everything just at it was. Like the existentialists and the logical positivists (the two most lively recent philosophical movements) they distrust systems, blueprints and grandiose schemes. They know too well what dubious emotions and motives often lurk behind these facades.

Social and political issues have little effect on this age group. The only social issue which seems to touch them very much is the race question. Not peace, not the hydrogen bomb, not a more just and meaningful society. All these things are too big and far-away. Even the race question is likely to be seen primarily in personal terms. If you would not be willing, should the occasion arise, to do something about it personally—to marry a Negro or have your children marry a Negro, to live in a Negro neighborhood, to have Negroes in your fraternal organizations—then you do not have the credentials.

This concern with personal ethics and individual responsibility is largely passive, strictly fenced in by an



awareness of how much evil the well-intentioned can do. There is little tendency to go out and "look for trouble" or to carry an ethical concern into wider areas. Many things have come to seem like much bigger problems than they used to. The young have met this by a kind of retrenchment, pulling in their expectations and their involvements.

A good deal of a bred-in-the-bone skepticism, again not intellectually formulated, but nonetheless operative, characterizes many students, even the more intellectual ones. They have been brought up in the time of the "great unmaskers"—particularly Marx and Freud. But then they have seen the unmaskers too unmasked. They have seen the residues of self-deception in Marxism and Freudianism. They are willing to listen to everything and everyone, but they preserve their skepticism. This is nothing very new. Through it shows the old Post-World-War-I spirit epitomized in the remark: "We are entirely surrounded by bunk."

### Non-Involvement

IT IS THE DEGREE of the non-involvement which comes as a surprise to many. Parents and teachers have commented on the fact that nothing seems to affect the young any more. They are shock-proof. Observers have reported on the uncanny, robot-like detachment of Korean war soldiers, even after they had left the Army. No matter what they were told, they had learned to say politely "Yes, sir."—"Throw 100 typewriters into the ocean." "Yes, sir." "Burn down that village." "Yes, sir." "We will have to cut off your leg." "Yes, sir." Inner detachment grows up with the sense of being pulled around by forces bigger than we are.

There is little or no interest in, or desire for, controversy. Getting on with people is thought to be much more important than winning arguments. The young have learned that there is no use, anyway, in arguing with people who do not speak the same language, or who are selling something, or whose only interest is in position or prestige. Perhaps too they sense that the pre-atomic man, the man whose patterns of thought were congealed before the atomic age, is a kind of fossil.

Rebelliousness is out-of-fashion. It is a mistake to believe that non-involvement leads to rebellion; the sources of rebellion are quite other. When there are no solid grounds for protest, *what is* asserts itself by a kind of divine right. In a world of unreality, the status quo has the only claim to reality: *it is*. Conventionalism is a total mood today. Even the rebels are amazingly conventional, largely because they do not really believe in their own rebellion. What is the sense of rocking the boat, if the rocking turns out to be only a gesture.

Living in a world that has been described as a domestic paradise surrounded by an international hell, many feel that there is no *need* to do anything about

the paradise and nothing that *can* be done about the hell. The success of the American system, apparently unmatched anywhere else in the world (and the young have been taught that you cannot argue with success) and the uncertainty of the future with its apocalyptic threats from outside both conspire to create conformity.

It is in this setting that religion has again begun to capture the interest of young people. Students no longer find it old-fashioned to be interested in religion. In many places *their* rebellion takes this form. Many a free-thinking parent has seen his child embrace religion, often a strict orthodoxy. Many who brought their children up in conventional churches have found them taking religion more seriously than was intended. It is no longer totally surprising when we hear that such and such a poet has gone into a monastery or that young writers are studying theology.

A significant indication is the respectability of religion on the college campus. Religious subjects now penetrate many parts of the curriculum. In a literature course there may be learned discussions of St. John of the Cross or Meister Eckhart. In philosophy courses the medieval philosophers are avidly studied and modern neo-Thomism gets a respectful hearing. In history religious interpretations of history are seriously considered. Most students probably do not go beyond an awareness that it is no longer modern to be anti-religious and that, on the contrary, nothing so quickly stamps one as behind-the-times.

For the minority of intellectual students, however, the situation is more complicated. For some, writers such as T. S. Eliot, Jacques Maritain and Martin Buber have mediated a return to more or less orthodox views. For the majority any kind of orthodoxy is still far away. For them religion is not primarily an answer but an *expression* of their problems. The religious figures who most appeal to them are those who were most tormented by doubt: Donne, Pascal, Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Gerard Manley Hopkins. This group, when it is not merely responding to social pressures, does not seek security or comfort in religion. (Marx and Freud disposed of religion used for that purpose.) It seeks an intensification, a new honesty and understanding.

### A Religion without God

THIS SEARCH typically results in an *unbelieving religion*, a religion without God. Three approaches to this have been of especial importance in the religious search of the intellectual college student. They are: the philosophical movement of existentialism, certain trends in modern psychology and psychoanalysis and the study of Eastern thought. Through these the student seeks to find a personal orientation, a framework for inner development and a renewal of the religious feelings of wonder and mystery.

"Is there a mystery?" asked Leo Stein. This question is the watershed of contemporary thought. It separates the two strongest philosophical tendencies: logical positivism and existentialism. On one side, the positivists either deny that there is any mystery or maintain that, even if there is, we cannot say anything about it. In the other, the existentialists say that the mysterious—what defies analysis and scientific investigation—is precisely the most important thing in our lives.

The existentialist philosophy, which because of its literary connections has had the wider influence, preaches either outright religion or a kind of religious atheism. The leading exponents of the latter view, Martin Heidegger and Jean Paul Sartre are, paradoxically, deeply religious. They reject a "shut-in" humanism. They want to relate man to something beyond himself. It is the Nothingness in and around life that they propose to take as seriously as any believer ever took God, to let it penetrate and determine their lives in every particular. Religious attitudes and religious emotions are directed toward that.

### The Religion of the "Unconscious"

A SECOND APPROACH of the intellectual college student to religion is through what is nebulously called the "Unconscious." This word with its semi-scientific connotations answers all questions. Obeisance before the Unconscious (often promoted by superficial acquaintance with the psychology of Jung) has led some to remark that for the present generation God is the Unconscious. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that the current formula is: If you don't know how to account for it, put it in the Unconscious.

Americans, with their emphasis on action, have been loath to admit the passive factor in human achievement, though it is known to all poets, artists and creative scientists. The poet's "inspiration", like the religious man's "revelation" cannot be coerced. It can only be waited for. (This is the significance of the profoundly religious play by Samuel Beckett, *Waiting for Godot*—that it points to perhaps the most important and, very likely, the most positive thing in human life—waiting.) Where does the inspiration or the revelation come from? The catch-all term that answers this question for the modern student is the Unconscious.

The idea of the Unconscious as the source of our higher inspirations, rather than merely as the repository of archaic animal instincts is quite un-Freudian and logically irreconcilable with a good deal of modern psychology. This is what has led some writers like Jacques Maritain to make a distinction between the Freudian unconscious and the "creative unconscious." It is then a short step to connect this creative unconscious with something outside ourselves. In this vein a Catholic writer declares that: "It is through the sub-rational that the super-rational enters human consciousness." Some

such idea lurks in the back of many minds today.

The third direction in which the religious search goes is toward Eastern thought. What the student finds here is a sense of direction and a conception of religious development (which he may then try to fit into some kind of evolutionary scheme). Even when he is not prepared to accept Eastern metaphysics or cosmology, he may be drawn to Eastern psychological and religious techniques. Hence the interest in Zen Buddhism, particularly among the avant-garde. Such writers as Gerald Heard, Aldous Huxley, Richard Gregg, Krishnamurti, Alan Watts, Alfred Orage and Georges Gurdjieff help to translate Eastern ideas into Western terms. The scientific studies of religion conducted by Pitirim Sorokin and his group and the frequently eclectic mysticism of Quakers also further this interest.

From many different points of view two fundamental questions are raised by such men as these: what are the possibilities of human development—not merely socially but also individually? And how can we change ourselves radically as individuals? The idea is found in many places today, but particularly among students of Eastern thought, that psychological and religious techniques must be consciously developed and applied for human betterment. Human changes, if they are not to die out into repetitions of the same old evils, must go to the very roots.

### A Yearning and a Doubt

THE STUDENTS who pursue these paths expect little or no help from the churches or synagogues. Sunday sermons do not inspire them. Ecclesiastical formulas communicate little, except what one clergyman has called "faded poetry." They would like to see institutional religion alive, changing and developing in its modes of expression, but they think of the churches and synagogues as largely bound by obsolete social patterns. They see religious institutions as too often confusing gentility with spirituality and the American Way of Life with the Way of God.

It has been a fundamental premise of many modern intellectuals that there is nothing higher than man. This premise has been accepted as a doctrine of liberation. But in some places today, the feeling grows that it is not reasonable to suppose that man is the highest thing in the universe. Some contemporary literature seems to be saying: Something perhaps is higher, but we can't find it or communicate with it. The characteristic note of the modern religious situation is a yearning for religion and a doubt about its possibility. Many are raising religious questions without being able to get religious answers. But where there is a desire for religion the lack of God may be described as religion too. And this is why the present atmosphere may be called "religious". Theologians recognize the absent God as, paradoxically, in some sense God too.



# Words are Not Enough

*In sending us his statement of resignation from the American Friends Service Committee, Lawrence Scott writes: "After taking prescribed doses of LIBERATION for more than a year, I feel like an old bag into which new wine has been poured. I feel liberated in some places and unliberated in others. . . It is hard to read LIBERATION for one year and remain a neutral or golden-mean man".*

*In the course of his statement, Scott refers to Speak Truth to Power, which is a forward-looking Quaker document published late in 1955 as part of a conscientious attempt by members and friends of the AFSC to make its work more meaningful.*

## LAWRENCE SCOTT

ONE OF THE REASONS why I have decided to leave the employ of the Friends Service Committee is that for some time I have not been easy in submitting to a withholding tax from my salary. This has deprived me of the witness which I felt inwardly led to make against the policy of the government in extracting money from my salary to be used for war purposes. In order to make any public witness at all I have refused for the past several years to make any tax return. I have not been at ease with this as a solution for two reasons:

1) the tax at the rate of more than \$500.00 for last year has already been extracted by the AFSC as agent of the government (Can any of us remember how horrified we were that German organizations and individuals complied with orders of their government in the disposal of Jews and others in gas chambers?)

2) refusal to make a tax return deprives me of my witness to the good things done by the government. However, the tax issue is only one of the factors that caused my decision to leave AFSC.

There are three categories of power to which we have a moral obligation to speak Truth—the people, the elected representatives and their appointees, and the "power elite". Now, the "power elite", while very real, is almost disembodied, institutional evil—impersonal and irresponsible. We can speak very little Truth to this category of power directly.

We can speak Truth to the second category of power—the elected representatives and their appointees. But this category of power is geared very closely to the ballot box. They cannot act morally in international

situations. Moral action demands a price of sacrifice. Even if they were willing personally to sacrifice for moral action (and some of them would be), they feel their constituents are not ready for such sacrifices.

Secondly, the economic and social order in America is one of mechanical relationship and violence, rather than of organic relationship and love. Attitudes that would make for international peace and non-violence are not present in everyday economic activities. The moral and spiritual ground is lacking.

Speaking words has become so cheap in this age that only the literal act has much meaning. The Logos—the Living Word—has always been the Way, whether in the time of Jesus or in the time of George Fox. Now, there is such a wide separation between cerebration and action that the individual or organization which confines its peace education to words only may be doing more harm than good by accentuating the separation between words and action. A pamphlet like *Speak Truth to Power* could become our Bible from which we preach and read texts without really speaking Truth to power. The Sermon on the Mount (a more revolutionary document than *Speak Truth to Power*) is read in almost all churches and preached about.

The ultimate decision for war or peace rests with the third category of power—the people. But even the people are to a great extent entrapped in the institutional evil of the economic and social order. They find themselves borne forward, or backward, by mechanical relationships which do violence to that within themselves which hungers for organic relationship. That is the





Power to which we must speak Truth; or as the early Quakers put it, we must "go up and down the world answering to That of God in every man".

Given the institutional character of evil, including the institution of government as incorporated into a religion of nationalism, there are two modes of the literal act that will speak Truth to the basic category of power—the people; and will enable them to regain hope.

### 1. *Civil disobedience, individual and corporate.*

In the history of Friends this is not new. But it has become words to most of the effete, middle-class Friends of today. How can we go on participating in the radiation poisoning of the air for future generations? How can we go on storing an arsenal of hydrogen bombs, deadly germ cultures, and guided missiles and not cry out with all the spiritual power God makes available to us against this desecration of God's creation? In Gethsemane Jesus faced the agony of the loss of the greatest dream mankind has known—the literal coming of the Kingdom of God on earth in great power. He knew His disciples were not ready to carry on with the dream of the transformation of men for the Kingdom of God on earth. Would not His untimely death scuttle the whole spiritual revolution? Does the American Friends Service Committee have a greater dream at stake than did Jesus? Must it go on compromising and being an agent of a government which wears the death mask as plain as the nose on the face of a man?

The people need leadership in disobedience to government and to other institutions and evil mores, such as racial discrimination. If the life of the AFSC depends upon its recognition as a safe organization by the government, and depends upon gifts from foundations piled up from exploitation of the economically weak, then the AFSC lacks that Life which is the light of men.

### 2. *A constructive program of economic and social revolution.*

Civil disobedience is not enough, and if it were engaged in without the constructive program which is essential it would only accentuate the sickness of society. No amount of civil disobedience would bring peace with freedom to an economic and social order based on mechanical relationships and violence between people. It might bring us into a dictatorship to cure the chaos in domestic affairs; it might bring us into an international dictatorship to cure the chaos in international affairs. The United States cannot disarm unilaterally and depend upon non-violent resistance to evil in an international arena which contains the dynamic of Communism and the dynamic of suppressed peoples to be politically and economically free, and at the same time retain an economic and social order which is counter to the moral order.

Quakers have little experience in the field of economic

revolution. They have done some pioneering in social reform and a lesser amount in economic reform (one price system, better working conditions, honest weight and measure, etc.). But the Creator has brought man face to face with the choice of his destiny, and the time for piecemeal reform is running out. Quakers have the historical precedent of insights which, if acted upon in the Light, would begin the economic revolution which would Speak Truth to Power. If there is that of God in every man then we must be a family or a spiritual organism. Can we affirm that Truth in the economic realm?

The basic economic factors are:

#### 1. *Land, and water.*

Any man who usurps more than his share of land and its resources for his *private* use acts counter to the Creative Will of God and is not in the Light. When he uses that usurped economic power further to exploit other men from whom he has stolen a birthright, he has compounded his evil act.

#### 2. *Labor, including management, engineers, constructive planners, etc.*

All talents are the gift of God and in a spiritual organism the more talented would share with the less talented. No man would use his talents to build economic power for the exploitation of other men. To do so is a denial of God, who is the giver of all gifts.

3. *Capital.* How can any man call that capital which has been entrusted to him his own, placing it into productive use only if he gets interest, dividends, and profits, which enable him to live from the labor of others?

In a civilization of mechanistic human relationships, such as ours, this kind of economics is simple-headed and foolish (ask any Economics professor, including the Quaker brand). But, in an organic order of human relations this is the way things would be. The Truth of the matter is that our mechanistic civilization is pulling apart at the seams, and the hydrogen bomb is the symbol of the impending explosion.

In leaving the employment of the AFSC I leave with the conviction that there is no organization doing more for peace education. But that is not enough. We do not have the sense of the early Quakers that "the power of God is over all". We do not have the sense of self-abandonment to the Light within, regardless of the consequences.

During the next year I hope to make an experiment with Truth as an itinerant minister. This is a general leading, but if the specific leading comes I will speak in Quaker and other steeple houses, on street corners, at factory entrances, and wherever led to do so.

Only time will tell to what extent my present impulse is the work of the idiot ego or to what extent it is the boldness which comes from true humility. I wish I knew.

# WHO CREATED WHOM?

MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN



WHEN I WENT to a liberal Jewish Sunday School, I learned much Jewish history and legend and took to heart the predominantly moral emphasis of liberal Judaism. My confirmation teacher defined Judaism as "an ethical monotheism", a statement I did not really wonder about until much later. Although I had never heard of ethics in the sense of moral philosophy, like many young liberal Jews I had a deep and unquestioning feeling for peace, justice, brotherhood, and social righteousness. If I had been asked for the connection between the ethical part of Judaism and its monotheism, I would undoubtedly have referred to The Ten Commandments. Yet I remember that at the age of twelve, I officially became an agnostic, since it seemed to me that what I had heard about heaven was too selfish to be worthy of God. I don't remember whether it was God or just the adults who taught me who fell short of my moral standards! But it was evident that my moral ideals could stand by themselves and had no need of theological underpinning. When it came time to give our confirmation speeches, I insisted on writing my own (the rabbi wrote the rest), and I bored or diverted the grown-ups among whom I had grown up with a blatantly rationalistic credo that I had recently picked up from a teacher in high school. All moral problems could be reduced to removing prejudice, clear thinking, rational decision, and acting on that decision.

Such a creed worked well enough until I found myself in a world at war in which all the values that I most cherished were set in conflict with one another. My immersion in economics, history, and political science at Harvard did nothing but deepen the conflict. The depth of my feeling for peace and social justice increased, if anything, but so did the conflict between them. I discovered that a strong sense of social values cannot in itself provide the answer to the question, "What ought I to do in this situation?" when one must choose between killing one's fellowmen and watching all that one believes in submerged under a mighty tide of totalitarianism.

Twenty years after my own confirmation, I returned to a liberal Temple, this time as the leader of a post-confirmation discussion group. One Sunday when the rabbi was called away, he asked me to take over his confirmation class. Informed that each student was reading in preparation for his confirmation speech (in this case the rabbi did not write them), I asked each in turn what subject he was studying. One girl said she was studying theology and explained that according

to the book she was reading this was really a matter of psychology—what psychological needs cause an individual to believe one religious concept or another. Another girl said she was studying man and explained that, according to the Bible, man was created in the image of God.

"But if theology is really psychology does that not mean that God was created in the image of man," I queried. Since no one was disturbed by this, I put on the blackboard two propositions, "God is created in the image of man" and "Man was created in the image of God" and went round the room to find in which each individual really believed. I discovered that without a single exception this class believed that God is created in the image of man and that religion is really a matter of psychology and needs. Like myself at their age, they considered this in no way incompatible with their being confirmed as Jews. Nor did the loss of God seem to distress them since, as one student put it, "We still have the Ten Commandments."

## Ethical Humanism

WHAT ARE the Ten Commandments without a God who commands? Universal and timeless values, perhaps, but in no sense commandments addressed to a people at a particular juncture of history, to an individual at a crucial moment of his personal life. And what is "ethical monotheism" when God is nothing other than "a symbol of the powers of man," as Erich Fromm approvingly defines "humanistic religion," or, as in the early writings of Mordecai Kaplan, a name for man's ideals, aspirations, and striving toward self-realization? The answer is "ethical humanism". When God is no longer the source of values but the name for them, what else can "ethical monotheism" mean?

Do not many of us religious liberals, Christian and Jew alike, regard God as the symbol of man's values? And values themselves as timeless universals—"peace", "justice", "brotherhood"—that remain impersonal, general, and abstract, addressed to everybody and nobody? Ethical humanism takes for granted our ethical obligation to work for a finer life for all men, yet it has nothing to say about the source of such an obligation, nothing to answer the person who denies that such an obligation exists. Do we religious liberals have any answer to such a question other than to translate our values into other values, such as creativity, self-realiza-



tion, needs, and interests, values which are equally undefined and usually contradictory as well? Ethical humanism overlooks the difficult and all-important question of how far the individual's realization of his potentialities and society's establishment of a good life for all are compatible with each other. Have we not made the same naive identification of self-realization and social welfare? Ethical humanism finds its roots in "the best" and its goal in "human achievement" without any criteria as to how one is to know what is "best", and what constitutes "achievement". Are we any better off? Ethical humanism regards moral values as the real essence of all religions and one's personal relation to God as a secondary and even unnecessary phenomenon. Have we not often done the same?

Does not liberal religion still vacillate between "ethical monotheism" and "ethical humanism", between "the Ten Commandments" and abstract universal values?

### "One Must" vs "Thou Shalt"

WE HAVE NOT taken seriously enough the question of how our universal values can be translated into concrete moral decision, the question of what answer our emotional allegiance to "peace, justice, and brotherhood" can give us when we are confronted by the question, "What ought I to do in this specific situation which demands a choice between two actions, both of which appear good or both of which appear bad?" It means, I think, that we have affirmed the oneness of God in temple and church and denied it in our lives by removing our values from the sphere of the present and the concrete to the "dawn of a new day," or to the messianic era at the end of history. We have used values as sources of emotional satisfaction or as consolations for the rotten, God-forsaken everyday world, rather than as the growing-point of our existence which enable us to authenticate our lives by becoming fully human, by becoming fully ourselves. We have substituted for the judgment of the prophet in the specific historical situation the "progressive revelation" of values which are too self-evident to need to be revealed, too universal to apply to any concrete present. We have lost that demand on the present moment, that judgment on present history which has held the present and future in tension throughout centuries of Jewish and Christian messianism. We have two sets of values—one that we profess as our "ideals" but relegate to the future as unrealizable at present, another that we live by in the present but do not admit even to ourselves. These latter are the real life-attitudes with which we respond to the situations which confront us. If we are conscious of them at all, we assure ourselves that these are practical necessities which are imposed on us.

Yet it is just in the seemingly irreconcilable conflict between the claims of Israel and the claims of her Arab neighbors, in the conflict we experience in ourselves

when we decide how we must respond to the cruel demands of present-day history, in the perplexity and heart-ache of trying to discover what it means in practice to deal lovingly with one's neighbor as one like oneself that our values are tried and that we rediscover the Thou who speaks in "Thou shalt."

Society wishes to preserve the Ten Commandments for their socially-integrating value, as Martin Buber has pointed out. But it translates the personal and specific "Thou shalt" of religion into the impersonal "one must" of morality, and it translates this morality, in turn, into objective law. By then it is neither religious nor moral since it does not help us answer the question "What ought I to do?" but only tells one what one must do if one does not wish to pay the penalty.

### The Voice of the Other

I CANNOT LOVE my neighbor as myself, unless I experience the relationship from his side as well as mine, unless to some extent, I know quite concretely what he is thinking, feeling, and willing and know this not as something objective but out of the relationship itself. A parent can only help his child if he listens to his child as well as talks to him, understands his child as he really is rather than as the embodiment of the parent's own hopes, fears, and frustrations. Otherwise the parent imposes on his child an external pattern that forces him to choose between being himself and being accepted, and insures that he will grow up either a hypocrite or a rebellious and lonely person. The teacher cannot educate and influence unless he teaches students as well as subjects, makes present to himself the person before him and sees the student's relationship to the subject matter through the eyes of the student as well as his own. The rabbi and the psychiatrist cannot help the individual who comes to him for spiritual guidance or psychotherapy if he does not relate to that person as someone unique and of value in himself, if he does not listen and respond. A young man cannot decide whether to go to war or be a conscientious objector, a social actionist cannot decide what is his true responsibility in a social crisis, unless he opens himself to the address of the situation and responds faithfully with his whole being. If we respond thus, we are not responding from needs and interests alone, nor to abstract ideals and sentimental values, but to what is directly asked of us in the concrete, personal situation.

God calls to us as to Adam, Where art Thou, and like Adam we hide. But when we cease to hide and answer, "I am here," to whom do we answer? Not to an idea or conception of God, not to universal process or civilization, not to dogma and tradition, nor religious or secular law. To the Voice that speaks to us in the present, through the events of our lives and the teachings that come alive for us in relation to these events, the voice of the Other who claims our lives as He did our fathers.



# The ARMY as CHURCH and SCHOOL

C. LeRoy Doty Jr.

IN ITS ATTEMPT to establish permanent military conscription the United States Army is presenting itself more and more as a character-building institution. It stresses increasingly what it claims are the educational and moral values of military service, rather than the "defense" needs.

This significant fact emerges vividly in the testimony given recently by Colonel C. M. Boyer before the House Armed Services Subcommittee. This testimony shows the extent to which the Army is prepared to take over the functions of the school and church in its ambition to achieve UMT (Universal Military Training).

Colonel Boyer gives a striking illustration of recruiting techniques used in Akron, Ohio. According to him, fourteen different military groups were trying to get into the various high schools in Akron at one time to sell their reserve programs to the students. Public school and PTA opposition was such that military presentations were limited to "career day", which came only once a year. In order to combat this limitation, all of the military groups got together and selected one civilian to represent them. Armed with the proper authority, this person succeeded in getting into all of the high schools and was so successful in recruiting students into the reserve program that his approach is to be used as a pattern all over the country.

The students are told something like this:

At least 50% of your education is social and consists of learning how to mix with people. A period of limited service in the armed forces provides you with an unusual opportunity to mix with many people. This is excellent background for almost any kind of vocation later on.

There are 4 things the armed forces teaches you that you have to learn in business or any vocation:

*You are taught to take orders from higher authority.* In almost any job you must take orders from higher-ups, and by learning it early in the armed forces you are that much better prepared.

*You learn to take orders from 2 types of people:* from officers you like and those you don't. This is good training, because in any business you must learn to accept suggestions from those who rub you the wrong way.

The third thing is to *eliminate carelessness* by emphasizing exactness and precision in basic training.

The final thing is to *eliminate procrastination*. The regular hours, three meals a day and the routines are factors that tend to eliminate the inclination to put things off.

If the student still fails to respond to this high pressure technique, *the parents are sometimes contacted*. The recruiting officer stresses the last 2 items as examples of what a few months of training in the armed forces can do for their son. This appeals greatly to some parents, whose teenagers in the process of maturing do procrastinate and are somewhat careless. There still seems to be a residue of feeling that agrees with the cliché that "the Army will make a man out of you".

Over 50% of the students know what they are going to do in terms of going to college, technical school, etc., Boyer said. The ones who do are the easiest to influence. They are the ones who feel they should get this thing over with so that they can get on with their life plans. The problem boils down to how to sell the 6 months basic training and 7½ years reserve program to this group. In Boyer's opinion, the Army should cut down on TV advertising and increase the amount spent for professional organizers. These organizers should be respected leaders in the local population who have an interest in the reserve program and can speak as civilians. *It is thought to be much better psychology if the whole thing appears as a civilian program and approach as against a military one.*

It appears that this recruiting technique, which was so successful in Akron, will soon be duplicated in every town in the U.S. The Pentagon is not now asking that the Government draft people into the reserve program, but instead is planning something that may be even more dangerous to the American way of life. This is a calculated plan to sell the public on the idea of their sons' doing limited service in the armed forces on an indefinite basis. *The approach is not to try to convince the public of the need for such a large reserve force in terms of defence, but to sell it in terms of its character-building values.*

In some localities where the armed forces have insisted that the high schools give them time to present the opportunities afforded in the services the local church groups have succeeded in getting the schools to grant them time to present the alternatives afforded conscientious objectors in lieu of military service. The danger in a one-sided presentation by the military is that military training will come to be regarded as a good thing in itself, that to require able-bodied male youths to serve in uniform for a period makes better citizens. The military is trying to sell the public on the idea that UMT should become a permanent part of American life, and is trying to do it through the "back door" of the reserve program.

good himself. It is not a grace given him, even by revolution".

Thus it may be said that Blake's ideal is anti-social, "but it is not an ideal which therefore withdraws from society. . . For Blake's ideal is not single and ascetic but is part of his lively dialectic". It is true that societies fall short of man's good, the society of the moment thwarts and corrupts it in many ways. But "men cannot be good, because they cannot be themselves, outside society. What is done always distorts what is imagined. But what has been imagined must be given shape by doing, and is not fully imagined until it has been done". And as man lives and makes good in himself only as he seeks to make it in society, so society lives only as it is being remade. "This is the full meaning of the dialectic of contraries, in Blake and in Marx; that no revolution is the last. This is a heavy

thought, but it is a living thought, that societies live only as they are remade".

By the same token, Blake, the true mystic and seeker after God, "knew that the blight must be fought within society. He was neither bigot enough, nor so idle a well-wisher, to think that man can make his good without that revolution. . . He did not lack the fire raging against content, and raging to remake society, not tomorrow but today."

This is the "dialectic" which neither Billy Graham nor most of our dialectical theologians nor most contemporary radicals or ex-radicals have understood and applied. It is the "dialectic" which is exemplified in the nonviolent struggles of the Negro churches in the South today and in such a community as Koinonia in Georgia. This is what Blake would have recognized as truly "building Jerusalem" in men's hearts and in their societies and as a contemporary validation of his conviction that the good can be built in the one only as it is built in the other.

## **Koinonia**

continued from page 10

a Baptist deacon and a lawyer to help us." He said: "I'll give you all the advice you want, but I cannot accept the case. I'd lose my home. I'd lose my practice. I'd lose my business." "But Bob", I said, "aren't you a Christian? Don't you follow Jesus?"

"Yes", he said, "up to a point."

"Bob", I said, "I admire your frankness, but I seriously question your discipleship. Jesus said 'Except a man take up his cross and follow me, he cannot be my disciple.' Now I think in all honesty you ought to go to church next Sunday and tell the people you are not a follower of Jesus Christ."

"Why", he said, "if all of us did that, there wouldn't be anyone left in the church."

Well, maybe there wouldn't. Maybe we could get along without that kind of churches anyway.

## **Surmounting the Differences**

APRIL 4, A SUMTER COUNTY Grand Jury made a series of presentments against Koinonia, climaxing in the charge that we were committing the violence against ourselves in an effort to win sympathy and contributions. They issued no indictment but gave official undergirding to the campaign against us. Perhaps they felt it necessary to do this because conscientious people in the area are beginning to react against the crude violence being used against us and are beginning to sympathize with our attempt to overcome evil with good. Significantly, the Grand Jury rebuked the American and Sumter County Ministerial Association for having passed a resolution condemning the violence: "This Grand Jury believes that the people of this county are entitled to expect the sincere cooperation

and helpfulness of those gentlemen who constitute the personnel of the Ministerial Association. If they are going to live with us they should work for us, and, if they can't do us good, they should strive not to do us harm."

Feeling the importance of appealing to the consciences of our neighbors, we have occasionally published paid advertisements to counteract some of the slander about us. After the Grand Jury presentments, we issued a statement which concluded:

"We reaffirm our intention to continue our struggle here until our right to believe is upheld and freedom of religion confirmed. . . If those who seek to drive us out are so determined that the choice is to leave or to die, then we shall have to die."

"We do not seek pity, we understand the deep differences that divide us from many of our neighbors, but we believe that love and understanding will surmount these differences. We cast ourselves now on the mercy of the community. We shall neither defend ourselves nor retaliate. We have faith in the goodness of God and the goodwill of our fellows."

On the same day, 23 white Georgia ministers—Baptist, Methodist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Lutheran—issued an open letter, stating:

"In regard to recent publicity concerning Koinonia . . . we . . . express our belief that:

"1. Koinonia Farm is a Christian Community.

"2. Acts of violence have come from persons outside the Koinonia group.

"3. No connection exists between Koinonia community and the Communist Party.

"We pray that God's truth and Christ's redeeming love may be revealed in this present crisis in Sumter County."

Beginning in next issue

the long-awaited

## AUTOBIOGRAPHY of A. J. MUSTE

---

### LIBERATION REPRINTS

#### HOPE IN THE MIDST OF APATHY

The Editors' initial editorial statement, originally published as *Tract For The Times*.

"If you have had reprints of *Tract For The Times* printed I would appreciate receiving one hundred copies."

Dean of Students  
at a leading Eastern University

15c each, eight copies \$1

### NOW AVAILABLE

#### CHILDREN. by Harold Feinstein

A timeless ten-page photo essay, by Feinstein.

Termed:

"...a rare and moving insight into the child's world."

Now, only 35c each, three copies \$1

---

#### WHERE ARE WE NOW? by A. J. Muste

American Radicalism and the impact of recent Soviet developments.

"A long-time observer of radical politics assesses the Khrushchev line...an important document."

*Fellowship* magazine  
reduced to 10c, 15 copies \$1

---

## **Liberation**

*an independent monthly*

110 Christopher Street, New York 14, N.Y.

Bulk Rate U. S. POSTAGE <b>PAID</b> PERMIT No. 9898 New York, N. Y.
---